

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWING

The attached sheets of drawing figures include changes to Figures 1 and 2 and the addition of new Figures 5 and 6. In Figures 1 and 2, the element previously labeled 60 has been correctly labeled 12 (as in the parent application). New Figures 5 and 6 are identical to Figures 1 and 2 with the addition of element 60 therein.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (2)

REMARKS

1. General.

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. The Examiner has objected to the Specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter with respect to an opaque lens in Claim 5. The Examiner objects to Claims 5 and 7 for informalities including lack of positive antecedent basis. Additionally, the Examiner has objected to the drawings for failure to show essential structural detail.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-10 under obviousness-type double patenting in view of Claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,715,911 in view of **Henoch**. Claims 1, 5, and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness as being unpatentable over **Blotky et al.** in view of **Henoch**. Claim 2 is rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Blotky et al.** in view of **Henoch** and further in view of **Watanabe**. Finally, the Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Blotky et al.** in view of **Henoch** and further in view of **Hornsby et al.**

2. Response on Objection to the Specification.

The Examiner has objected to the Specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicant understands the Examiner's reference to Claim 5 to be more appropriately directed instead to Claim 4 which references an opaque lens. Claim 4 has been canceled. Amendments have been made to the Specification to clarify and correct language referencing the LCD 12 and the LEDs 60.

3. Response on Claim Objections.

The Examiner objects to Claims 5 and 7 for informalities including lack of positive antecedent basis. Once again, Applicant understands the Examiner's reference to Claim 5 to be more appropriately directed instead to Claim 4 which references an opaque lens. Claim 4 has been canceled. The Examiner is correct in that the lens is not opaque.

Claim 7 has been amended to properly depend from Claim 6 in order to provide positive antecedent basis for "said plurality of buttons."

4. Response on Drawing Objections.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for failure to show essential structural detail, specifically, the LCD 12, cavity 22, circuitry and printed circuit board as described in the Specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are submitted herewith.

5. Response on Double Patenting Rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-10 under obviousness-type double patenting in view of Claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,715,911 in view of **Henoch** (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0038067 A1). Applicant has addressed this rejection with the filing of a Terminal Disclaimer.

6. Response on Rejection of Claims 1, 5, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 5, and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness as being unpatentable over **Blotky et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,084) in view of **Henoch**. **Blotky et al.** discloses a watch or other jewelry article that incorporates an

LCD that may be altered to itself present different images formed out of the LCD pixels. There is no separate image as in the present invention. Therefore **Blotky et al.** does not disclose all of the elements of the claimed invention (with the exception of the LED) and fails to teach the use of an LCD as a “screen” that may alternate between being transparent and opaque. In addition, **Henoch** teaches the use of an LED in a small flashlight device. There is no “image” to be illuminated and no suggestion that some adjacent component within the small flashlight may be illuminated by the LED. There would, therefore, be no inclination to combine the references cited to arrive at the present invention. The present invention incorporates (and claims) a combination of an LCD, at least one LED, and a separate planar image whose structure and function are different from that described or taught by the cited references. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to clarify these distinctions.

7. Response on Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Blotky et al.** in view of **Henoch** and further in view of **Watanabe**. (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,520 B1). Applicant repeats herein the above arguments with respect to the independent Claim 1 above as equally applicable with regard to the Examiner’s view of Claim 2.

8. Response on Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Blotky et al.** in view of **Henoch** and further in view of **Hornsby et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,527,610). Applicant repeats herein the above arguments with respect to the independent Claim 1 above as equally applicable with regard to the Examiner’s view of Claim 3.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSION

Applicant now respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims previously rejected and their passage to allowance. Should any further impediments to allowance remain, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated phone number.

Respectfully submitted,

KAMMER BROWNING PLLC
7700 Broadway, Suite 202
San Antonio, TX 78209
(210) 832-0900
(210) 832-0901 (Fax)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

By: 
MARK A. KAMMER, Reg. No. 34,197

Date: 31 OCTOBER 2005